



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

sive; once admit his principle (a principle clearly his own, not that of his opponents), that the church is bound to acquiesce in the judgment of the Pope, and the conclusion which Milner thinks it better to deny than to defend, follows at once.

But Milner replies, Bellarmine is here speaking *hypothetically*. To be sure he is speaking hypothetically, and we cited him as speaking hypothetically. We fancy Milner wished his readers to suppose that "speaking hypothetically" means saying something that one does not believe, or is not sure of, and does not wish to "teach positively." For the benefit, then, of our unlearned readers, we beg to explain that a hypothetical proposition means nothing more than a sentence with an *if* in it; and that one may be as sure of a hypothetical proposition, and teach it as positively as any other. We may be quite sure that, "if there is no rain we shall have a bad harvest," even though we are not at all sure whether it will rain or not, or whether the harvest will be good or not. Now, whatever virtues there may be in the cardinal's "*if*" we have faithfully preserved.* We do not accuse him of saying that Popes are in the habit of commanding vices, and forbidding virtues: neither do we charge him with maintaining that the church is bound to believe virtues to be good, or vices evil; it is quite beside the question to discuss what his opinion may be on either of these points; but we re-assert, advisedly, that Bellarmine maintains—what we admit to be, in logical language, a "hypothetical proposition," but still a very monstrous one, and worthy of as many notes of exclamation as we may choose to affix to it—viz., that "IF the Pope should so far err as to command vice, and to prohibit virtues, then the church would be bound to believe that vices are good, and virtues evil!!!"

We now call on "Investigator" to refer to Bellarmine himself, and to try whether he can find any trace of the words which Milner has interpolated. We look with some curiosity to see whether he will make us the "*amende honorable*" for the unfounded charge he has brought against us, or whether he will "seek to evade the difficulty in which he has placed"—*himself*.

ON INFALLIBILITY.

[In our March number, we inserted a letter from Mr. Rourke, so extremely long, that we were obliged to omit several valuable communications from other respected correspondents. As he has now sent us another letter, of almost equal length, we trust he will not be offended, if we break it up into paragraphs, and make a few brief remarks on each, as we go on. Our printer has directions to insert as much of the letter as he can find room for.—ED.]

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

"SIR—I again beg to tender you my meed of thanks for your kindness in giving my last letter a place in your periodical. I read with sorrow and not with anger, your observations on that letter, which clearly showed that you had lost equanimity in replying to it. Now, I would say, let us argue dispassionately, in a Christian spirit, and with that charity which 'is not easily provoked.' Let us 'be kindly affectioned one to another with brotherly love.'"

[We should be sorry if any of our readers had good reason to suppose that the tone of our comments on Mr. Rourke's former letter exhibited a want of proper equanimity. All we said was—that Mr. Rourke's second letter was very long, and declamatory, and dictatorial, rather than argumentative. We think so still; and hope it was no breach of Christian charity to say so, especially when we, in the same paragraph, praised the ability and clearness of his previous letter. We can hardly regret having said so much, since Mr. Rourke's present letter is considerably more to the purpose.]

"When I entered the field of controversy with you, Mr. Editor, I did so as a simple, unlearned member of the Catholic Church, and not as a logician or a theologian; so if my style of writing be quaint, and my language destitute of rhetorical and argumentative flourishes, your readers, I hope, will not be surprised, nor yourself disappointed."

[To this we have only to say, that we beg, in future, Mr. Rourke will favour us with as many arguments as he pleases, and as little as possible of the "rhetorical flourishes."]

"Having said so much by way of preface, I will, with your permission, resume my subject, by giving, first, a quotation from the Holy Book, which irrefragably proves the infallibility of the Church of Christ. The apostle of nations, in writing to the Ephesians, says 'that God has not only placed in his church, apostles, prophets, and evangelists, but also pastors and teachers'—Eph. iv. 2. For what end? 'For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the minis-

try, for the edifying of the body of Christ."—Eph. v. 12. How long? 'Till we all come to the unity of faith.'—Eph. v. 13. For what end? 'That henceforth we be no more like children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive.'—Eph. v. 14. This is evidently spoken in reference to the people who are here taught—first, that the pastors of the church are appointed by God himself to be their guides in faith; secondly, that these guides shall continue in the Church of Christ without ceasing to the end of the world—'till we all come to the unity of faith'; thirdly, that, in all controversies of religion, it belongs to these guides to fix the wavering judgment of the people, against all the wicked arts of impostors and seducers, and that, by consequence, the faithful ought to rely on their directions with an entire confidence. For the apostle says—'We are of God: he that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God, heareth us not. By this we know the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error.'—1 John iv. 6. For unless they may be safely depended on, they would not fully answer the end of their institution; the people, especially the ignorant, upon every new and difficult debate, would be left in uncertainty, and might even suspect their guides to be their seducers."

[We have now, again, to complain that Mr. Rourke mixes up very plain texts of Scripture with very doubtful comments of his own. Every member of the Church of England readily assents to the statement of the apostle, that God has appointed pastors and teachers in his church, and that the office of such teachers is to instruct and edify the people, who are the body of Christ. But what the apostle does not assert is, that such pastors and teachers cannot possibly fall into error, and that in every difficult debate the people may always absolutely depend on them without any uncertainty, or any necessity of inquiring for themselves. Now, a divine of the Church of Rome cannot consistently adopt Mr. Rourke's interpretation of this passage; for the Church of Rome acknowledges the orders of the Greek Church. There are about fifty millions of Christians whose pastors (according to the Romish theory) teach fatal error; whose "guides are their seducers," and on whose directions the "people cannot rely with an entire confidence." It is plain, therefore, that any texts which merely assert that God has appointed an order of clergy for the teaching of the people, cannot be interpreted to mean, that the directions of such clergy can be followed implicitly without risk of error.

It is scarcely necessary to say, how irrelevant is the text cited from St. John's epistle, from which Mr. Rourke seems to infer that every clergyman of the present day is as divinely inspired as were St. John and his brother apostles.]

"But blessed for ever be the mercy of God who has settled upon earth a visible church, which is the pillar and ground of truth, against which the gates of hell shall never prevail; and to which he has promised the Spirit of Truth for ever. So that I leave any one to judge whether they who refuse to submit their private reason to the authority of this Church, be not in danger of being self-convicted at the great tribunal of God; and I leave it to him to consider whether any man can hope to attain salvation who lives wilfully out of the communion of that church which Christ came to establish for the salvation of mankind, and of which it is said—'The Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved.'—Acts ii. 47. If all men had but faith enough to believe the church established by Christ himself, to be our guide, and humility enough to submit their judgment to her's, there had never been any heresy in the Christian world. Which, as it shows, on the one hand, the excellency of Christ's institution, so, on the other, it is a dreadful instance of the pride and misery of mankind, who had rather lose heaven by presumption, than gain it by following better lights than their own."

[This paragraph is pervaded by Mr. Rourke's old fallacy, that what is said in Scripture of the church must necessarily be understood of the Church of Rome—a church which actually *did not exist* at the time to which the passage in Acts ii. refers! We are as certain as Mr. Rourke is, that no man can rationally hope to attain salvation who lives wilfully out of the communion of the true Church of Christ—of which, it is said in that chapter—"The Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved."]

"Well, I have given you nearly twenty passages from the Divine Book which clearly, ay, irrefutably prove the infallibility of the Church of Christ. But you cannot see infallibility in those passages. I will tell you why you cannot see it. Because (I do not mean the slightest offence), you are walking in 'the valley of the shadow of death,' and because you are 'blind without sleep.'"

[This passage contains only "rhetorical and argumentative flourishes;" we do not think it necessary to give any reply to it, beyond assuring Mr. R. that it does not disturb our "equanimity" in the least. Whether it be consistent with Christian charity to charge one's opponent with wilful blindness to what is irrefutably proved by the Holy Scriptures, we leave to the judgment of our dispassionate readers.]

"Pardon this digression. To continue, we believe that in the Gospel is recorded a part, and, indeed, a very small part, of what Christ did and preached during his visible existence on earth.—See John xxi. 25.

"We believe the authors of those Gospels to have been inspired by the Holy Ghost, and, therefore, we believe every

word contained in them, as proceeding from the fountain of truth. As we believe the Gospel of Christ to be a divine book, so we believe that none but a divine authority can expound the same. We shudder at the idea of bringing that divine book before the tribunal of limited or corrupted reason, and we candidly confess that, although we were provided with a greater share of wisdom and knowledge than Solomon possessed, we should still be unequal of ourselves, to the task of understanding and explaining the Gospel, or other parts of Holy Writ. In this we are confirmed by St. Peter, who says that 'no prophecy of the Scripture is made by private interpretation.'—2 Peter i. 20. As we believe that Holy Scripture is the Word of God, as we believe that Holy Scripture, misrepresented, is not the Word of God, but the word of corrupted man; and that Scripture is often misrepresented, we are obliged to believe, from the assertion of St. Peter, who tells us that the unlearned and unstable wrest the Scriptures to their own destruction.—See 2 Peter iii. 16. And likewise from our own observations. For, as "common sense" tells us, that the Holy Ghost cannot be the author of contradictory doctrines, so it tells us that numbers of doctrines, preached pretentiously from Scripture, must be false, as they stand in contradiction to other doctrines drawn from the same Scripture."

[Mr. Rourke here draws very strange conclusions from the principles which we hold in common with him. We all agree, that the Scriptures were given by the inspiration of God, for the instruction of his people; He knew the extent of man's ability, and He surely had power to express those doctrines which He deemed it needful for man to know, in such language that a man of humble and teachable mind could understand them. But, Mr. Rourke seems to proceed upon the principle that the greater the wisdom of him who speaks, the greater the difficulty of understanding the meaning of what he says; so that while any peasant can understand what a priest speaks or writes, not even "the wisdom of Solomon can understand or explain" what is written by the inspiration of God himself.

Mr. Rourke quotes two passages from the second Epistle of St. Peter, in support of his views. The first of these is plainly irrelevant. According to Mr. Rourke's own translation, the passage states, how prophecy is "made," not how it is to be explained; which meaning appears, to be confirmed by the concluding words of the verse, which Mr. Rourke has omitted to cite—"for holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." The second passage is a very favourite one with Roman Catholic controversial writers; but familiar as we are with Mr. Rourke's interpretations of Scripture, we needed no formal proof that it is very possible to wrest texts of the Bible to a sense very different from what the writers intended. But, notwithstanding this, a moment's examination of the text, from 2 Pet. iii. 16, proves two points—one, that in St. Peter's time, the "unlearned and unstable" had the Scriptures in their hands, contrary to the modern practice of the Church of Rome; the other, that the remedy given by St. Peter for such risk of misinterpretation was not to close up the volume of Scripture altogether, and trust to the interpretation of the church, which is the plan Mr. Rourke would suggest, but (see the following verse) "to grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ"—a knowledge which can only be acquired by the constant study of those very Scriptures which are able to make us wise unto salvation.

We quite agree with Mr. Rourke in the concluding assertion of the paragraph, that "the Holy Ghost cannot be the author of contradictory doctrines;" and this is one of our reasons for believing that either the ancient or modern Church of Rome must have erred grievously from the true faith. If Mr. Rourke will refer to an article in our present number on this subject, he will find it proved, beyond the possibility of contradiction, that, upon several most important points, the ancient and modern Church of Rome do put forward contradictory doctrines. If the ancient Church was right, then the modern Church of Rome is in great error. If, on the other hand, the modern doctrines be true, then the Church of Rome could not always have been infallible. Mr. Rourke is at liberty to select whichever horn of the dilemma he pleases.]

(To be continued in our next).

ON PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD AND THE BURIAL SERVICE.

WE received some time ago a letter from Mr. E. Power, for which we were unable to make room in our last two numbers. Finding that its unmanageable length rendered it uncertain whether it could be inserted in the present number, we have been unwilling to postpone it any longer, and have, therefore, had recourse to the same expedient, as in the case of Mr. Rourke; printing half of it now, and leaving the other half for next month.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—That Mr. Thorndike did not hold the belief of the Church of England on the subject of prayers for the dead, is notorious from the passage which I cited from his writings; and hence the purpose for which I cited that passage (though you could not conceive it), and to which I have so palpably and exclusively applied it, must be self-evident—namely, to show how oddly the doctrine laid down therein contrasts with that of the burial office; for if the doctrine advocated by this learned Protestant be orthodox,

* A curious instance of the reckless manner in which Roman Catholic divines have come to the defence of Bellarmine, is afforded by Dr. Wiseman, or some other writer in the "Dublin Review," edited by him. Dr. Wordsworth having cited this same passage from Bellarmine, the reviewer writes—"What would Dr. Wordsworth say of us if we were to charge him with the following opinion, which we give in his own words—'The infidel might justly assert that all our religion is a bare groundless faith.' We have done with his book only what he has done with that of Bellarmine, suppressed the hypothetical clause." It is quite true that the process by which the reviewer got this doctrine out of Dr. Wordsworth's book was by mutilating a sentence, and leaving out the hypothetical clause; but Dr. Wordsworth does not treat the cardinal in like manner, but copies his *as faithfully* as we did ourselves.

that of the burial office cannot be so too, and *vice versa*. In this respect it is then, I grant, dangerous to quote from Mr. Thorndike's book, and brag forward a passage developing a system of prayers for the dead so manifestly different from that of the Protestant Church, but dangerous to the burial office only. We have here, also, a decided proof of the incongruity of doctrinal opinions, which marks the principles of Protestants; principles which, while their advocates endeavour to apply them to the support of one particular form of belief, are equally available in defence of every other system, how contradictory soever. You assert that, with regard to the burial of impenitent sinners, there is no material difference between the Churches of England and Rome; but you are compelled to defend your practice, in this respect, by the saving interrogatory, "how are we to know that a sinner died incorrigible and impenitent?" This may be considered a very rational query regarding your Church, which is utterly deficient of the discipline established by Christ and his apostles, for punishing notorious sinners, but it does not establish on this head (the burial of impenitent sinners) the uniformity of the two Churches. You allege, "we never heard of any priest refusing money when asked to pray for one who died in his communion;" but as this is an expedient to throw dust in the eyes of your readers, and in no respect applicable to the subject of debate, permit me to set the matter right, by asking, have you ever heard of a priest accepting money for praying for incorrigible, impenitent sinners, who, by their notoriously wicked lives, separated themselves from his communion? I could, if necessary, supply instances of the refusal of Christian burial to the remains of persons excluded from the Catholic Church, on account of their impious lives, when conscience could not nor would not be sacrificed to *mammon*.

Following your example, I now maintain, on the contrary, I have never known a minister to refuse to read the *Burial office* over the remains of any one offered for interment. I never heard of him alleging "it is a bad case;" "I could not, with a safe conscience, read this office over the remains of N.—. L.—, who lived in a state of concubinage fully thirty years, and up to the day of his death, I could not, under such circumstances, prostitute religion to so vile a purpose; to the encouragement of vice; to the pardoning of lukewarm sinners, and to the disedification of the good and the virtuous." No; but with an affectation of religious solemnity, he recites, "For as much as it hath pleased Almighty God of his great mercy, to take unto himself the soul of our dear brother departed," &c.; and "we give thee hearty thanks, for that it hath pleased thee to deliver this our brother," &c.; and "that when we depart this life we may rest in him as our hope as this our brother doth," &c. These words you read over all that are buried, incorrigible, impenitent sinners included: the law compels you, and the terrors of a prosecution are an *argumentum ad hominem* too powerful to be resisted.

In CATHOLIC LAYMAN, Vol. ii., No. 20, page 93, you assert, "prayers for the dead are never countenanced nor vindicated further than as they may rely on the promise and Word of God; and as we do not go beyond this, how can we be taunted with admitting prayers for the dead not warranted by Scripture?" I confess I have no desire to disturb your equanimity again, yet, I cannot forbear asking what warrant of Scripture have you for these prayers, in cases such as this I have now stated? a case to which, when I fill up the blanks, I can fearlessly challenge contradiction. I have already alluded to the want of discipline in the Church of England; your annual wishes (*Commination office*) although of about 300 years' standing, have not yet attained the object wished for. Thus the Protestant Liturgy affords *prima facie* and incontestable evidence of a total want, in the Church of England, of that *godly discipline* so strictly enforced in the primitive Church. You cannot subject sinners to "open penance;" you cannot reprove an unworthy member, and dismiss him from the Christians' community; and hence, I agree with you, that it is impossible to know whether notorious sinners in your Church become truly penitent or not before their death.

This want of discipline is admitted by Dr. Wake, in a sermon at Whitehall, 1690, on 1 Tim. v. He says—"The great temper and moderation of our present discipline, that I do not say some defect in it permits not us (the clergy) to make a severe inquiry into sin, and punish it, as St. Paul commanded Timothy to do. We cannot call sinners publicly into the Church, and lay open their crimes to them, and rebuke them before all, that others also may fear. But the civil magistrate hath great opportunities of supplying this defect; and, no doubt, God will require it so much the more at their hands, in that it is now no longer in ours." Hence the Church of England, independently as a Church, having no authority to rebuke notorious sinners, or to separate them from her communion, cannot pretend to exclude the remains of such from the rites of burial prescribed by law. Another Protestant authority complains thus of this want of discipline—"The Church of England hath, for 200 years, wished for the restoration of discipline, and yet it is but an ineffective wish. For nothing has been done towards introducing it, but rather things are gone backward."—*Bingham's Antiq. sub Ann.* 1719, b. 15, cap. 9, sec. 8.

I could adduce innumerable quotations to the same purpose, and all of them from Protestants whose zeal for the Reformed Church places them beyond the reach of suspi-

cion; yet I shall only add one more—"The restoring of the ancient discipline is earnestly desired by the Church of England in her office of *Commination*—but with due submission be it spoken, methinks too much like dissembling with God, and imposing on the people, to have this passage stand in our *public Liturgy*, and read solemnly once a year, and yet no attempt made towards the restoring of this *godly and much wished-for*, but still *neglected discipline*."—*Ellesley's Caution against ill company*, 1705, *pref. pages* 2, 3. Thus, we have corroborating evidence, the most satisfactory and conclusive, that the Church of England has not now, nor had not at any period since the Reformation, that true Christian discipline which our Lord himself ordained, to preserve his Church, pure and free, from corruption; and which is as evidently an essential principle of the true Church, and an ordinance of Christ, as any other portion of his religion.

St. Paul says (Heb. xiii. 17), that pastors must account for the souls of their flocks, but Bishop Wake tells us God will require this account at the hands of the civil magistrate; yet, taking Timothy as an exemplar of all true Christian bishops, and admitting the Scripture as the infallible Word of God, it must be confessed that the discipline of the Church of Christ, with respect to notorious sinners, is as irrevocably the same to day as in the days of Timothy, and that the clergy have the same or equal authority to rebuke, to exhort, and to chastise, by penitential discipline. In this conclusion I am supported by the authority of the Church of England, which defines the Church of Christ thus:—"The true Church hath always three notes or marks, whereby it is known—pure and sound doctrine, the sacraments ministered according to Christ's holy institution, and the right use of ecclesiastical discipline."—*Hom. on Whitsunday, part 2, page* 393.

From these observations I am incidentally led to notice another peculiarity of the Church of England. By her own definition of the true Church, it appears that three essential properties are required as constituent and inherent principles so intimately and inseparably connected with its very nature and institution, that, without them, it cannot continue to be the Church of Christ; and I have shown, from unexceptionable authority, the Protestant Liturgy and the testimony of Protestant divines, that one essential property of the true Church is wanting in the Church of England; therefore, by her own doctrine, she cannot be the true Church of Christ.

Thus, have I given you another instance of my knowledge of Protestant principles, with which, I venture to affirm, ninety-nine out of every hundred Protestants are as little acquainted as they are with the affairs passing in the moon. I presume I have satisfied you as to the object for which I quoted from Mr. Thorndike's work; not that I fancied I could find prayers for the dead and purgatory proved thereby; but to show that learned Protestants cannot be satisfied as to the orthodoxy of the burial office, and therefore, they advocate other systems of prayers for the dead.

(To be continued.)

[We must commence by explaining the allusion to Mr. Thorndike, for the benefit of our new subscribers. In our last volume, Mr. Power discussed with us, in several letters, the question, what evidence could be adduced in support of the doctrine of purgatory. And among other authorities he brought forward first, a passage from Mr. Johnson's "Unbloody Sacrifice;" and more recently, another from the writing of Mr. Thorndike. Now, when we referred to the places cited by Mr. Power, we felt bound, in charity, to believe that he had taken his quotations secondhand, without once turning to the original of the passages quoted. Both the one writer and the other were engaged (in the very passages which Mr. Power says, "vividly set forth the belief of his church") in proving that the ancients did not hold the doctrine of purgatory, and in explaining the object of the prayers for the dead which they admit, were used in the church, at an early period. As we have had often occasion to do the same thing ourselves, we expect, at some future time, to see garbled extracts from our pages, introduced into Roman Catholic manuals of controversy, and to find the CATHOLIC LAYMAN cited among other Protestant testimonies to the truth of the doctrine of purgatory. On our pointing out the way in which Mr. Power had been misled as to Mr. Thorndike, our correspondent has not acted with the candour we had hoped for; and instead of plainly confessing that he had been deceived by an unfaithful quotation, he shifts his ground and tells us that he cited Mr. Thorndike only for the purpose of showing how opposed his views were to those of the burial service!

Strange, if this were the case. Mr. Thorndike lived and died a clergyman of the Church of England; and if he had occasion to bury any one, we have no reason to suppose that he ever used any other ritual. We may say, too, for ourselves, that we cannot discover any contradiction between the sentiments cited from him, and the doctrine of the Church of England, expressed in the burial service. But whether there be or not, is a controversy with which we certainly shall not occupy our pages. For what is Mr. Thorndike to us? Supposing that it were true, that while holding the office of clergyman of the Church of England, he in reality believed the doctrines of the Quakers, or of the Socinians, or of the Church of Rome, how does it affect our position? Is Mr. Thorndike the founder of our religion? Supposing we could show that Cardinal Wiseman was a Mahometan in disguise, would Mr. Power think it

necessary to turn Turk? It may be an interesting subject of inquiry to ascertain the exact private opinions of individual modern divines; but we cannot give up any of the space of this journal to topics of mere literary curiosity; and we would desire all our correspondents to confine themselves to the points really at issue between the Church of England and the Church of Rome.

Mr. Power proceeds next to a topic, which is nearly as irrelevant to the question of purgatory as the opinions of Mr. Thorndike—viz., the general question of church discipline. We beg to remind our correspondent that this journal was established for the purpose of discussing those important doctrines, upon which the Church of England differs from the Church of Rome, and not those upon which honest members of the Church of England may lawfully differ among themselves. It is obvious, from Mr. Power's quotations from Church of England writers, that the question which he raises is one of the latter class. We had some doubts whether it would not have been better to have, at once, reduced his letter to limits more suited to the size of our journal, by the omission of all his remarks on this subject; and the only reason which deterred us from adopting this course was the fact, that he seemed to attach considerable importance to them, and we were, therefore, unwilling that any of our correspondents should have reason to charge us with even the semblance of unfairness or partiality. While we are willing to admit, that the discipline of the Church of England might be made more strict than it is, we deny altogether the justice of Mr. Power's sweeping censures against her on this point. Before we are obliged, however, to inquire what portion of truth there may be in these censures, we must ask our correspondent does he seriously maintain, that "true Christian discipline is evidently an essential principle of the true church;" or, in other words, that if Christian discipline be wanting, or inefficiently exercised, the church necessarily ceases to exist? To us such a course of argument, in an advocate of the Church of Rome, appears absolutely suicidal.

In the very first page of that well-known Roman Catholic work, "Bossuet's Variations," what do we read? Speaking of the beginning of the sixteenth century, he says—"A reform of ecclesiastical discipline had been wanted several centuries before. 'Who will grant me,' says St. Bernard, 'before I die, to see the Church of God such as she had been in the primitive times?'" Disorders had still increased since that time. The disorders of the clergy were represented in this manner to Eugenius IV. by Cardinal Julian. "These disorders," said he, "excite the hatred of the people against the whole ecclesiastical order; and should they not be corrected, it is to be feared lest the laity should rise against the clergy; . . . for it will be said," proceeded he, "that the clergy are incorrigible, and will apply no remedy to their disorders." Mr. Power sneers at the Church of England for her annual wishes for reformation of about 300 years' standing; but here we see that the Church of Rome, according to the acknowledgment of one of the ablest of her own controversial writers, needed a reformation of ecclesiastical discipline for several centuries. From a period of time long anterior to St. Bernard, down to the sixteenth century, the state of the church of Rome was getting worse and worse, until, at last, according to the confession of one of her own cardinals, there was much risk that the people would consider the clergy quite *incorrigible*. Or, if the authority of Bossuet be considered insufficient, let our readers turn to the extracts from the ecclesiastical annals of Cardinal Baronius, under the dates A.D. 900 and 912, which we had occasion to quote in another article in our present number, p. 58.*

Other citations to the same effect have been given, vol. 2, p. 121. For example, the declaration of Pope Adrian VI.—"For a long time there have existed many abominations in this holy see, abuses of spiritual things, excesses in the exercises of jurisdiction; all things have been changed and perverted. Corruption has descended from the head to the members, from the supreme pontiff to the inferior prelates." And still more to the point, is the confession of Bellarmine, which we cited in the same place:—"Some years before the rise of the Lutheran and Calvinistic heresy, according to the testimony of those who were then alive, there was almost an entire abandonment of equity in the ecclesiastical judgments: in morals, no discipline; in sacred literature, no erudition; in divine things, no reverence—religion was almost extinct."—*Supra*, p. 57.

May we not now retort upon Mr. Power his own argument, which he advances so triumphantly? and may we not say, that we "have shown, from unexceptionable authority, and the testimony of [Roman Catholic] divines, that one essential property of the true church is wanting in the Church of [Rome]. Therefore, by her own doctrine, she cannot be the true Church of Christ."

But enough of such painful pictures, which Mr. Power's argument has compelled us to bring forward. We should be unwilling to close these remarks without pointing out to Mr. Power, and to our other readers, what we believe to be the true state of the case, as regards this difficult question of church discipline. Our Lord's parable of the tares and the wheat has always foreshadowed the state of the church in each successive age—the evil ever mingled with the good. All human devices to effect an entire separation between these two opposing elements must of

* The original Latin text of these extracts from Baronius is given at length in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, for October, 1852, vol. i., p. 109.

necessity prove efficacious; and the important practical question is, whether the system of the Church of Rome, which professes to effect this separation, does not in reality produce more moral injury upon the minds of hypocrites and others, whom no discipline can reach, and whom she allows to remain within the pale of the church, than the course adopted by the Church of England, of throwing the responsibility of the state of each individual Christian more directly and immediately upon himself. A member of the Church of England is under no temptation to harden himself in sin by the knowledge that the clergyman who reads the church service over his grave may, in accordance with the ritual, express a charitable hope of his future state. He knows that such an expression can exercise no influence whatever upon his condition in the unseen world. Very different, however, is the effect of the practical working of the Romish system, as we see it constantly before our eyes. The most pious saint that ever lived could not express a more confident hope of eternal happiness and salvation than is put forth continually by blood-stained criminals of the Romish faith, as they stand on the scaffold to pay the penalty of their evil deeds. We ask, can that system be true which enjoins and authorizes vice thus to claim the blessings which should belong only to virtue?

FLOWERS FOR MAY.

HAPPY, joyous May! loveliest and cheeriest month of the year, with its gleams of bright sunshine and shadows of soft green light, its thousand commingling voices above and around, calling upon all nature to join in the chorus of praise and thanksgiving to him "who maketh his sun to shine upon the good and the bad, and raineth upon the just and the unjust."—Matt. v. 4, 5 (Douay Bible). Is there one so dull and thankless as not to respond to the call?

"Wake! for shame! thou sluggish heart.
Wake! and gladly sing thy part.
Learn of birds, and streams, and flowers,
How to use thy nobler powers."

As we saunter out on a May morning to welcome the approaching summer, it is not to the cultivated parterre or the formal flower garden that our steps incline, but to the open fields and meadows. At all times agreeable to the eyes, and refreshing in the dreariest months of winter, they are now invested with richer and peculiar attractions. Daisies, and buttercups, and cowslips overspread the grass, and the hedges are whitening with the hawthorn. The daisy, however, claims the first place in our attention in a May meadow; on entering which, we are sure to meet the "wee, modest, crimson-tipped flower" in myriads around our feet, in starlike spangles on the green carpet of nature. Some one has called it the Robin red-breast of flowers.

The term daisy, as spelt in old English (day's-eye), wrapped up in a word, a piece of simple, natural poetry. It expressed that the flower, like the eyes of other wee and pretty things, grows sleepy at the decline of day, and closes at the evening fall. The peasant who first gave this descriptive appellation to the "bonny gem," had the fancy of a poet, as much as a Chaucer, of whom it is said that he used to lie in the fields all day long to watch the daisy open its round eyes in the morning and close them in the evening.

The botanical name of the daisy is *Bellis perennis*, or pretty perennial. The French call it *Petite Marguerite* (little pearl), and *Paquerette* (Easter flower). The Italians call it *Pratolina* (meadow flower), and *fiore di primavera* (spring-tide flower). It was once a flower of great renown, and worn by valiant knights and gentlemen. It was the device of the unhappy Margaret of Anjou, and afterwards of the celebrated Margaret of Valois, the sister of Francis the First, and friend of Erasmus and Calvin. So that, however humble may be its birth and estimation with those who regard nothing as rich but what is rare, the common daisy flower has been valued highly by those who could associate true nobility with simplicity of nature. Were we to attempt a description of it, our readers would imagine we were undertaking a very superfluous task; but familiar as it is, there are many who have never stooped to examine a daisy just before it has opened and scattered its leaves, and while its florets, each tipped with a delicate rose-colour, are clustered into one group, forming a cynosure of beauty that might compete with anything to be found in the garden or greenhouse. Examined through a microscope, nothing more perfect can be seen, and its exquisite beauty and symmetry can then only be appreciated.

"Who but he who arched the skies,
And pours the day-springs living flood,
Wondrous alike in all his trice,
Could rear the daisy's purple bud.

Mould its green cup, its wiry stem,
Its fringed border nicely spin,
And cup the gold-embossed gem
That, set in silver, gleams within.

And fling it, unrestrained and free,
O'er hill and dale, and desert sod,
That man, wherever he walks, may see
In every step, the stamp of God."

But, surely, we need not appeal to the appliances of science to create an interest in favour of the daisy—

"'Tis Flora's page, in every place,
In every meadow fresh and fair,
It opens with perennial grace,
And blossoms everywhere.

On waste and woodland, rock and plain,
Its humble buds unheeded rise—
The rose has but a summer reign,
The daisy never dies."

So sung a Christian poet,* who, within the last few days has been summoned hence, to join his sweet harp with those around the throne of God, where no doubt he is issuing with a loud voice continually, "Worthy is the lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing."—Apocalypse v. 12. The daisy was no unworthy theme for a Christian poet in his passing pilgrimage on earth. Its very name was fraught with recollections of happy childhood; it leads him back to his early days of innocence and simplicity, when he roamed through fields and meadows in search of daisies, and buttercups, and cowslips. It is emphatically the child's own flower; and, with propriety, has been made the emblem of that pure and happy innocence which belongs to a child:—

"Type and emblem thou may'st be
Of that rare simplicity
Which, in every Christian mind
Should its place of resting find;
Mingling, with its scorn of state,
Meekness to the rich and great,
Faith to rest on in the way,
Hope to lend its cheering ray:
Conscious that the hand which tries
All its latent energies,
Can, with more than equal power,
Bear it through temptation's hour,
Still the conflict, soothe its sighs,
And plant it 'neath congenial skies.
Such the lesson thou may'st meet
In the daisy at thy feet."

Our blessed Lord told his disciples that except they were converted and became as little children, they should not enter into the kingdom of God.—Matt. xviii. 2. For of such is the kingdom of God.—Mark ix. 14, 15. He told Nicodemus that except a man be born again, of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot see the kingdom of God.—John iii. 5. He did not mean merely that they were to become pure, and simple, and innocent as children, although this may also be true metaphorically, but he plainly, and over and over again, taught them, that they must experience a new birth, actual and literal, not by entering the second time into their mother's womb, but by being born again of the Spirit of God—the Holy Ghost. This may read strange in the eyes of our Roman Catholic readers, as it sounded strange in the ears of Nicodemus, until he was taught by his blessed Master not to marvel at the saying.

As the month advances, the fields are in a blaze of buttercups and cowslips, reminding us, as somebody has said, of the descent of Jupiter in a shower of gold. The BUTTERCUP or king-cup (French, *Pied de coq*, cocksfoot, and *bouton d'or*, gold-button) is a species of *ranunculus* or crowfoot (*Ranunculus bulbosus*). It derives its name of buttercup or butter-flower, from its being supposed that its flower imparts the yellow colour to the butter at this period of the year, being taken as fodder by the cows. This, however, is a popular error, the buttercup, like all the *ranunculus* family, being very acrid and pungent in its taste, so much so, that neither cows nor horses will touch it for food. This general supposition is just about as true as that the fairies use the flower of the buttercup for their goblets, which, doubtless, many good people once believed.

"And fairies now, no doubt, unseen,
At silent revels sup,
With dew-drop bumpers toast their queen,
From crow-flowers' golden cup.

The COWSLIP (*primula veris*) is now also in rich profusion in our meadows. This "fragrant dueller of the lea" is distinguished from the primrose by the smaller size of its tall and pensile flowers. A line of Ben Jonson betrays the homely derivation of its name, when he speaks of

"Bright day's-eyes, and the lips of cows."

The oxslip is another species of the same family; but with somewhat larger flowers, and, no doubt, has its name from a similar association.

The HAWTHORN, or white-thorn, was called, in old Saxon, the hedge-thorn. Before the change in the calendar, May-day did not happen till about the 12th of our present month, and then the hedges were white with the pearly blossoms of the hawthorn, which was thence called "the May." It was a custom of the olden times, on a May morning, to go to the woods at break of day, and bring away boughs of the hawthorn, and hang them on every door. This was supposed to have been a remnant of Druidical superstition; but, apart from that, it was a natural and interesting custom. We believe some such custom still lingers in Greece.

Though we must pass many flowers unnoticed, yet must we say a word respecting the LILY OF THE VALLEY (*Convallaria majalis*). What can surpass the beauty of its delicate bells, as they hang, half-hidden in the shade of its broad, green leaves! This sweet-scented, modest little flower is sometimes associated with our Lord's comparison of the lilies of the field and Solomon's splendour. This, however, is a mistake, as the lily which suggested the comparison is generally acknowledged to be the scarlet martagon lily, which is very plentiful in the fields in Syria.

"But not the less, sweet spring-tide flower,
Dost thou display Thy Maker's power,
His skill and handy-work.
Our western valley's humble child,
Where in green nook of woodland wild,
Thy modest blossoms lurk.

* The poet, James Montgomery, who died on 30th April last.

What though nor care, nor art be thine,
The loom to ply, the thread to twine,
Yet born to bloom and fade,
Still, too, a lovelier robe arrays,
Than e'en in Israel's brightest days,
Her wealthiest kings arrayed."

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR MAY.

(From the Irish Farmers' Gazette.)

THIS being the month most appropriate for general green cropping, it will be of most importance, in order to get them sown in proper time, that all other routine work should be previously disposed of.

Barley.—Sowing should, therefore, be finished without delay. The surface should be worked very fine for this grain to insure an even braird; it may be sown broadcast under the plough, or ribbed or drilled in—in whatever way it may be deposited, no time should be lost in this dry weather in covering, and immediately rolling, so as to prevent evaporation and preserve as much of the natural moisture in the land as possible; steeping the seed from 24 to 36 hours in soft water, to forward germination, will be of much benefit, but it will require careful watching in the steep, as in warm close weather, it will vegetate much quicker than when it is cold and harsh; as soon as it shows symptoms of sprouting it should be sown, and carefully covered without delay.

Grass and Clover Seeds.—Barley is the best grain crop to sow grass and clover seeds with, which should be sown immediately after the barley is covered, then bush harrowed and rolled, all small seeds are more equally dispersed, and covered by having the land rolled previous to sowing, but should be finished with the roller.

Mangel-wurzel.—This crop, which is of the greatest possible value with carrots, to those who would have plenty of good milk and butter during the winter, without that offensive taste which all the turnip tribe invariably communicate, requires a deep, rich, friable loam, or a moory soil, and cannot be grown to perfection without the aid of a plentiful supply of farm-yard manure. After the drills are formed and well rolled, the seeds may be dibbled in, two or three seeds in each hole, at from fifteen to eighteen inches apart, in rich and sheltered soils; and at from twelve to fifteen inches apart, in soils not so rich, or more exposed, or sown in a continuous line by the turnip-harrow, adjusting the holes to allow the seed to pass. The seeds should be steeped in soft water for at least forty-eight hours; set to drain; and dried with wood or other ashes, or fine, dry rabbit-sand; the dibble-holes should not exceed $1\frac{1}{2}$ inches deep. A very expeditious sort of dibble has been figured repeatedly in the GAZETTE; it will be found at page 159, of volume iii. It is usual with some to sow the mangels at half the above distances, with the intention of removing every second plant, when they begin to touch or incommode each other, and which gives an abundant supply of green feeding. When sown in a continuous line the plants are afterwards singled out to the above distances. The best time to sow mangels is between the last week in April and the 20th of May. The ordinary quantity of seed required is about 4 lbs. per Irish acre; the long red gives the heaviest crop in good, deep ground; the globe varieties are the best for ordinary soils; and the best for keeping is the orange globe. Mangels may also be sown in raised drills in beds; we prefer making the drills across the beds to making them lengthways, as by having them across, all the necessary operations of forming, manuring, sowing, thinning, hoeing, weeding, &c., can be performed from the furrows, between the beds, without putting the foot upon the bed.

White Globe or Norfolk Turnips.—When required for early sheep feeding, a breadth of white turnips may be sown by the middle of the month, which will come in by September, and be of great service.

Dale's Hybrid and Aberdeen Turnips may be sown from the middle to the end of the month.

Carrots and Parsnips will now require much careful attention, in hoeing and weeding; if sown early, and their progress strong, they will require thinning by the end of the month.

Chicory may still be sown till the tenth of the month, in drills prepared as if for turnips.

Spring Vetches.—Breadths suitable to the consumption of the above valuable soiling crop should be sown once a fortnight. Mix the vetches with about one-fourth of oats, and about 4 lb. of rape, it adds considerably to the bulk of the provender, and serves to keep the vetches off the ground.

Rye and Winter Vetches.—The former will be coming into use early in the month; the latter at later periods. As fast as they are consumed the land should be turned up and prepared for turnips.

Pigs.—Fat pigs should be disposed of before the month commences, and all others kept in store condition. Green clover, vetches, &c., may be given them in their yard, or if a clover field can be exclusively devoted to this stock, they will be maintained in health, strength, and good growing condition, till the end of the season, when food, more adapted for fattening, comes in plentifully. This is a good month to admit sows to the boar, that farrowing may take place in time for the young ones to get a good size and hardy before cold weather sets in.